UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,380	07/29/2003	Kirk Edward Vandezande	101384-22	6539

27388 7590 09/19/2008

NORRIS, MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS
875 THIRD AVE
18TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER
ZHOU, SHUBO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1631	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/629,380	VANDEZANDE, KIRK EDWARD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHUBO (Joe) ZHOU	1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 August 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-14 and 22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-14 and 22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

RCE

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but prior to a decision on the appeal. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/12/08 has been entered.

Claims 1-2, 4-14 and 22 are currently pending and under consideration.

Applicant's arguments filed 8/12/08 in response to the previous Office action have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be fully persuasive. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated from the previous Office action or newly applied but necessitated by applicant's amendments, and constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application. Rejections and/or objections set forth in the previous Office action but not reiterated herein are hereby withdrawn.

Specifically, the rejection of claims 4-11 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, the rejection of claims 4-14 under 35 USC 102 and the rejection of claims 1-2 under 35 USC 103(a) are withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments filed 8/12/08.

Claim Rejections-35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-2, 4-14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

This rejection is reiterated from the previous Office action.

The claims are drawn to a process or a computer readable medium comprising computer executable instructions to perform the process or a system for performing the process, for determining an optimal test order for diagnosing mutations related to a disease. The process comprises receiving data, creating a database, receiving new data, applying a decision tree algorithm and generating a recommendation.

Since the invention involves mathematical algorithm, a judicial exception to statutory subject matter, the following analysis of facts of this particular patent application follows the rationale suggested in the "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" (OG Notices: 22 November 2005, available from the US PTO website at http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/og/2005/week47/og200547.htm, a copy of which is enclosed herein).

The Guidelines states:

> *To satisfy section 101 requirements, the claim must be for a practical application of the § 101 judicial exception, which can be identified in various ways (Guidelines, p. 19):*

- The claimed invention "transforms" an article or physical object to a different state or thing.
- The claimed invention otherwise produces a useful, concrete and tangible result, based on the factors discussed below.

In the instant case, the claimed invention is a process of manipulating and converting data in a computational device and does not transform an article or physical object to a different state or thing outside a computation device.

Furthermore, the claimed process (claims 12-14 and 22) does not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. Specifically it does not produce a tangible result. While the last step of the process identifies an optimal genetic test order, the final result is not used or made available to be used by a user. The claims are thus drawn to nonstatutory subject matter.

The rejection of the process claims could be overcome by amendment of the claims to recite a step of outputting the specific final result to a user. Applicant, however, is cautioned against introducing new matter into the claims.

As to claims 1-2 and 4-11, drawn to computer readable medium comprising instructions and system for performing the method process, since the method process is nonstatutory as not producing a useful, concrete and tangible result, a computer readable medium comprising instructions and system for performing the method process are nonstatutory for the same reasons. Additionally, it is recognized in the art that computer readable medium could include carrier wave, which is a signal and nonstutory, at least one embodiment of claims 1 and 2 is nonstatutory as being drawn to a signal.

Furthermore, with regard to claims 1-2, drawn to computer readable medium, while the instant specification does not explicitly define the scope of the limitation of "computer readable

medium," one skilled in the art would understand that computer readable medium includes carrier wave, which is a signal. For example, Fiekowsky et al., in US patent 6,090,555 (Date of Patent: July 18, 2000), define computer readable medium as being "a CD-ROM, floppy disk, tape, flash memory, system memory, hard drive, and a data signal embodied in a carrier wave." See column 14, claim 12. Bornstein et al., in US patent 6,1443,88 (Date of patent : Nov. 7, 2000) state, "The computer readable medium of the present invention generally includes a tape, a floppy disk, a CD ROM, a carrier wave. In a preferred embodiment, however, the computer readable medium of the present invention is a carrier wave." See column 8, lines 33-37.

Therefore, at least one embodiment of the instant claim * is drawn to carrier wave or a signal encoded thereon a computer program.

It was held by the court that claims that recite nothing but the physical characteristics of a form of energy, such as a frequency, voltage, or the strength of a magnetic field, define energy or magnetism, per se, and as such, are nonstatutory natural phenomena. O'Reilly, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 112-14. Moreover, it does not appear that a claim reciting a signal encoded with functional descriptive material, e.g. a computer program, falls within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in § 101. The following analysis on why such a signal encoded with functional descriptive material is nonstatutory subject matter is excerpted from the US PTO's "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" (OG Notices: 22 November 2005, available from the US PTO website at http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/og/2005/week47/og200547.htm):

> *First, a claimed signal is clearly not a "process" under § 101 because it is not a series of steps. The other three § 101 classes of machine, compositions of matter and manufactures*

"relate to structural entities and can be grouped as 'product' claims in order to contrast them with process claims." 1 D. Chisum, Patents §1.02 (1994. The three product classes have traditionally required physical structure or material.

"The term machine includes every mechanical device or combination of mechanical device or combination of mechanical powers and devices to perform some function and produce a certain effect or result." Corning v. Burden, 56 U.S. (15 How.) 252, 267 (1854). A modern definition of machine would no doubt include electronic devices which perform functions. Indeed, devices such as flip-flops and computers are referred to in computer science as sequential machines. A claimed signal has no physical structure, does not itself perform any useful, concrete and tangible result and, thus, does not fit within the definition of a machine.

A "composition of matter" "covers all compositions of two or more substances and includes all composite articles, whether they be results of chemical union, or of mechanical mixture, or whether they be gases, fluids, powders or solids." Shell Development Co. v. Watson, 149 F. Supp. 279, 280, 113 USPQ 265, 266 (D.D.C. 1957), aff'd, 252 F.2d 861, 116 USPQ 428 (D.C. Cir. 1958). A claimed signal is not matter, but a form of energy, and therefore is not a composition of matter.

The Supreme Court has read the term "manufacture" in accordance with its dictionary definition to mean 'the production of articles for use from raw or prepared materials by giving to these materials new forms, qualities, properties, or combinations, whether by hand-labor or by machinery." Diamond v. Chakrabarty, 447 U.S. 303, 308, 206 USPQ 193, 196-97 (1980) (quoting American Fruit Growers, Inc. v. Brogdex Co., 283 U.S. 1, 11, 8 USPQ 131, 133 (1931), which, in turn, quotes the Century Dictionary). Other courts have applied similar definitions. See American Disappearing Bed Co. v. Arnaelsteen, 182 F. 324, 325 (9th Cir. 1910), cert. denied, 220 U.S. 622 (1911). These definitions require physical substance, which a claimed signal does not have. Congress can be presumed to be aware of an administrative or judicial interpretation of a statute and to adopt that interpretation when it re-enacts a statute without change. Lorillard v. Pons, 434 U.S. 575, 580 (1978). Thus, Congress must be presumed to have been aware of the interpretation of manufacture in American Fruit Growers when it passed the 1952 Patent Act.

A manufacture is also defined as the residual class of product. 1 Chisum, § 1.02[3] (citing W. Robinson, The Law of Patents for Useful Inventions 270 (1890)). A product is a tangible physical article or object, some form of matter, which a signal is not. That the other two product classes, machine and composition of matter, require physical matter is evidence that a manufacture was also intended to require physical matter. A signal, a form of energy, does not fall within either of the two definitions of manufacture. Thus, a signal does not fall within one of the four statutory classes of § 101.

[.....]

> *These interim guidelines propose that such signal claims are ineligible for patent protection because they do not fall within any of the four statutory classes of § 101. Public comment is sought for further evaluation of this question.*

Thus, claims 1-2 are drawn to nonstatutory subject matter.

Applicant's arguments field 8/12/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the notion of "physical transformation" is not an invariable requirement but merely one example of how a mathematical algorithm may bring about a useful application. See page 7 of the response. This is not disputed by the Office and is consistent with the Office's position set forth in the previous Office action. See page 6 of the final rejection mailed 12/13/07.

Applicant further argues that the "claimed invention does correspond to a useful, concrete and tangible thing, that is the identification of an optimal genetic test order." See page 7 of the response. This is not found persuasive because firstly it is unclear what is meant by the notion that the instant invention does "correspond" to a useful, concrete and tangible thing. Does it mean while itself does not produce, but related to a useful, concrete and tangible thing? Secondly, the amended process still does not produce a tangible result because while it produces identification of an optimal test order, it is not used or provided to be available to be used by a user. The rejection of the process claims could be overcome by amendment of the claims to recite a step of outputting the specific final result to a user.

Applicant also argues that in determining whether the claim is for a "practical application", the focus is not on whether the steps taken to achieve a particular result are useful,

tangible and concrete, but rather that the final result achieved by the claimed invention is "useful, tangible and concrete". See page 7 of the response. This notion is not disputed by the Office. Consistent with the notion, the Office set forth that even if the final result produced by the process, i.e. the optimal test order, may be useful, there is at least one embodiment of the invention that is not tangible because it is not used and not available to be used by a user.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shubo (Joe) Zhou, whose telephone number is 571-272-0724. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marjorie Moran, can be reached on 571-272-0720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public. For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

/Shubo (Joe) Zhou/

SHUBO (JOE) ZHOU, PH.D.

PRIMARY EXAMINER